

**REMARKS**

Claims 1- 21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 10-12 are independent. In light of the remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Solhjell et al.* (USP 5,375,245) in view of *Ando* (USP 5,931,951). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner admits that *Solhjell et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least one display device monitoring a state of coupling with the host device. The Examiner relies on the teachings of *Ando* to cure the deficiencies of *Solhjell et al.* citing to column 13, lines 1-10 and 35-37' column 14, lines 47-67; and Figure 2. The Examiner concludes it would have be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of *Solhjell et al.* with the teachings of *Ando* in order to render the pending claim obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of these references.

The disclosure of *Ando* is directed to a computer system for preventing cache malfunctions by invalidating the cache during a period of switching to normal operation mode from power saving mode.

*Ando* discloses a power saving routine that causes the CPU 11 to operate in different states. Specifically, *Ando* discloses three operating states that differ in power dissipation which are the normal state, the stop grant state and the stop clock state. In the normal state of the CPU 11, instructions are executed and a maximum amount of power is dissipated. In the stop clock state, instruction execution, an external clock **CLK** and an internal clock **CLK2** of the CPU 11 are stopped and a minimum amount of power is dissipated. The stop grant state is an operating state between the normal state and the stop clock state and no instruction is executed (see column 13, line 35-64).

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image display system comprising at least one display device connected to a host device wherein the at least one display device monitors the state of coupling with the host device. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Ando* that is directed to the display device monitoring the state of coupling with the host device.

*Ando* merely discloses sending a stop clock signal **STPCLK** to the CPU 11 so as to make a transition from between the normal state and the stop grant state. While in the stop grant state the external clock CLK can be placed in the stop clock state by stopping the external clock (see column 13, line 60 – column 14, line 9). Therefore, by making a transition between the normal state, stop grant state and stop clock state, different amount of power is dissipated.

Furthermore, assuming arguments that *Ando* monitors a state of coupling with the host device, it is not the display device that monitors a state of coupling with the host device as

recited in pending claim 1. Thus, *Ando* does not disclose a display device that monitors a state of coupling with the host device.

As such, Applicants maintain that *Ando* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Solhjell et al.* As neither of the reference, either alone or in combination, assuming these references are combineable, which Applicants do not admit, teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the references as cited by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3, 13, and 19-21 for allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 4, 5, and 10-12 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with the claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the references as cited by the Examiner.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 09/878,193  
Amendment dated September 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 14, 2005

Docket No.: 0717-0469P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

*Constance M. Vanner*  
*Ref: 52,321*  
By   
19 Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant